

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

NORMAN CRITTENDON,

v.

NATHANIEL QUARTERMAN.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§

C.A. NO. C-07-275

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING**

Petitioner is an inmate in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division, and is currently incarcerated at the Connally Unit in Kenedy, Texas. Proceeding pro se, he filed a habeas petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. (D.E. 1). Pending is petitioner's motion for an evidentiary hearing. (D.E. 4).


Rule 8(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases states that "[i]f the petition is not dismissed, the judge must review the answer, any transcripts and records of state-court proceedings, and any materials submitted under Rule 7 to determine whether an evidentiary hearing is warranted." Rule 8(c) further requires that "[t]he judge must conduct the hearing as soon as practicable after giving the attorneys adequate time to investigate and prepare." The Fifth Circuit has explained that "[a] hearing in a habeas proceeding is required only when, *inter alia*, the record reveals a genuine factual dispute." Tague v. Puckett, 874 F.2d 1013, 1015 (5th Cir. 1989) (emphasis added); see also Murphy v. Johnson, 205 F.3d 809, 815-16 (5th Cir. 2000) (discussing basis for evidentiary hearing).

Petitioner is challenging three disciplinary cases that occurred while he was incarcerated at the Coffield Unit in Anderson County, Texas. (D.E. 1, at 2, 5). In the pending motion, he argues for an evidentiary hearing pursuant to Spears v. McCotter, 766 F.2d 179 (5th Cir. 1985).

(D.E. 4, at 1). A Spears hearing is an evidentiary hearing conducted in prisoner § 1983 actions. See Adams v. Hansen, 906 F.2d 192, 193 n.1 (5th Cir. 1990) (citing Spears, 766 F.2d at 181-82). Moreover, respondent has not yet had the opportunity to respond to petitioner's assertions, and nothing presented to date indicates that an evidentiary hearing is warranted.

It is therefore ORDERED that petitioner's motion for an evidentiary hearing, (D.E. 4), be DENIED without prejudice.

ORDERED this 19th day of June 2007.

  
BRIAN L. OWSLEY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE